

first paragraph, as incorporating new matter. As discussed during the Examiner interview, the Examiner is withdrawing this rejection in light of the discussion presented in the interview. Applicant has also made a clarifying amendment to the claims as set forth above, in light of such discussions.

Accordingly, formal withdrawal of the rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Naimark, *et al.* Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Naimark, *et al.* reference does not disclose the "processing resources, connected with the tag storage and the video storage, including first program steps which assemble a content video image in response to the tags, the content video image including positions for corresponding frames of video data in the plurality, and the processing resources including second program steps which associate positions in the content video image with addresses of storage locations storing corresponding frames of video data;" as recited in claim 1.

In the present invention, tags on video frames, such as for example, SMPTE time codes, are assembled by a data processing resource into a content image, and a data processing resource to positions on the content image.

The Naimark, *et al.* patent fails to describe any system whatsoever for assembling the content video image in reliance on the tags as recited in claim 1. In Naimark, *et al.*, the content image corresponds to the "data space" which is described at column 4, line 7 through column 5, line 4. There is no discussion at all in Naimark of how the data space is configured and mapped to frames of video. Rather, the Naimark reference merely states the structure, without discussing how it is assembled.

Claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends.

Accordingly, rejection of claim 1 and claim 2, which depends on claim 1, as anticipated by Naimark, *et al.* is believed in error. Further, Naimark, *et al.* does not suggest how the creation of the content image might be automated as recited in the claims.

As to claim 7, as discussed above, the Naimark, *et al.* reference fails to disclose the step of executing a program which "assembles and displays a content video image in response to the tags, the content video image including positions indicating the content of corresponding frames of video data in the plurality..." Accordingly, Naimark, *et al.* fails to anticipate claim 7, and claims 8 and 9 which depend from claim 7.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 7-9 as anticipated by Naimark, *et al.* is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Morgan. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As to the claim 3, the Morgan reference fails to disclose:

"a content image display which displays a content video image representative of an organization of content addressable video, the content video image having positions within the content video image corresponding to desired content of video image to be displayed;

a controller, in communication with the content image display, which generates control signals indicating content for video images in response to respective positions in the content video image."

Furthermore, the Morgan reference does not include the data processing resources recited in the claim which include "a program routine which associates the addresses of the stored frames of video data with respect to positions in the content video image."

As to claim 6, the Morgan fails to disclose a monitor which is responsive to input to display frames of video from the video storage as recited in the claim. Furthermore, claim 6 distinguishes over the reference for at least the same reason as claim 3 from which it depends.

As to claim 10, the Morgan fails to describe the step of "executing a program with data processing resources which generates control signals indicating a content for a video image in response to the selected positions within the content video image...". Also, Morgan does not teach the step of "executing program steps with data processing resources which associate the address of each frame of video data with a position in the content video image."

Similarly, as to claim 13, the Morgan reference does not describe the steps recited therein. Further, claim 13 distinguishes over Morgan for at least the same reasons as claim 10 from which it depends.

The Morgan reference has nothing to do with generating content addressable video frames, as recited in claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 in the present application. Rather, Morgan describes a close circuit television network. Once the video has been shot and stored by the system of Morgan, there is no structure similar to that being claimed in the present application for retrieving video frames according to content. Morgan provides a system for real time control of cameras which results in storing standard video, without any mapping of the stored frames. Accordingly, the Examiner's reading of Morgan is believed incorrect. Furthermore, Morgan does not suggest the claimed invention.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner rejected 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Morgan, in view of the 1985 ICAR paper by Toshiba Corporation.

Claim 4 depends from 3 and claim 11 depends from claim 10. Thus, claims 4 and 11 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as their parent claims. Furthermore, the 1985 ICAR paper cited by the Examiner does not describe the use of robot-mounted video cameras in the system claimed. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 1997

By: 

Mark A. Haynes  
Registration No. 30,846

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
650 Page Mill Road; MS: B2/2  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1050  
Telephone: (415)493-9300